

REMARKS

Claims 10-12, 15-23 and 26-28 have been cancelled by this amendment. Thus, only claims 1, 2, 4-9 and 29-34 are pending in the present application.

The Examiner in paragraph 4 of the Official Action rejected claims 1, 2, 4-9, 29-33 and 44-47 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applebaum et al. in view of Robertson et al. for the reasons set forth therein. Applicants respectfully submits that Applebaum et al. in combination with Robertson et al. fail to teach or suggest the invention as claimed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a dual sided integral composite image product having a first support substrate having a separate image layer thereon and a second support substrate having a separate image layer thereon. The first and second substrates are secured together so as to form a dual sided integral composite image product. The product having a full line about which the integral composite image product may be folded.

The Applebaum et al. reference is directed to an album wherein a separate individual prints/panels e.g. 4 and 6, or 32, 34 and 36 are secured to hinge members 8, 10 or 38 and 40 respectively. This is in complete contrast to the present invention which is directed to dual sided integral composite image product, which includes a support substrate having an image layer formed thereon. In the Applebaum et al. reference, there is provided a gap "G" separated the separate image panels. The Examiner refers to column 5, lines 25-30 indicating that images may be provided on both sides. However, this is not directed to an integral composite image product. In the present invention, the two integral substrates are integrally formed and are secured together. In the Applebaum et al. reference, the images are secured to the hinges and not to each other. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submits that it could not provide an integral product in a manner taught by applicant. Further, as previously pointed out, there is no fold line in the image product as taught and claimed by applicants.

The Examiner cites the Robertson et al. reference for illustrating a hinge/fold line on the image product. In particular, the Examiner refers to Fig. 3. In this regard, as stated in column 3, lines 42-45, side by side strips of opaque, imageable film 168 and reverse-printable backlit formulation 172 are preferably extrusion-coated or coextruded on top of the film 164. Therefore, these print areas are not an integral product. It can also be seen that printing occurs only on one side. In particular, on imageable film 168 and formulation 172. Thus, as when the product is folded as illustrated in Fig. 7, the reverse graphics will be seen through the film 164 in the


correct readable orientation. Applicant respectfully submits that the Robertson et al. patent fails to teach or suggest the providing of a fold line on the integral image product as taught and claimed by applicants. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the two products illustrated by the Applebaum et al. and Robertson et al. references are directed to two totally different products. Accordingly, it would not be obvious to combine the references suggested by the Examiner. The Applebaum et al. reference is directed to cutting of prints and securing them by hinges; whereas the Robertson et al. reference is directed to a particular sheet construction for printing on one side of a product that when folded will provide correctable viewable images. There is no teaching, motivation or suggestion that one would take one and combine it with the other as suggested by the Examiner. Furthermore, even if they were combined, it still fails to teach the invention as taught and claimed by applicants. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submits that independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentably distinct over the cited prior art.

Likewise second independent claim 29 includes the same limitations as set forth by independent claim 1 and further includes wherein there is provided a leaf an a cover. Thus, it is patentably distinct for the same reasons as previously discussed with regard to claim 1 and in addition, the prior art totally fails to teach or suggest wherein one of the dual sided integral products will be combined to form the cover as taught and claimed by applicants.

The remaining claims depend at least ultimately upon independent claim 29 and are therefore patentably distinct for the reasons previously discussed. The remaining references cited by the Examiner still fail to teach or suggest the invention as presently set forth in independent claims 1 and 29 and are therefore patentably distinct for the same reasons previously discussed.

In view of the foregoing applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/djw
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 588-2728
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646